

DATE: 2 December 2015
TO: ALL MEMBERS OF COUNCIL
FROM: Annette Revet, Executive Director and University Secretary
RE: **FALL MEETING OF COUNCIL AGENDA**

A meeting of Council will be held on Wednesday, December 9, 2015 9:30 –11:00 a.m. in the Education Auditorium, ED 106, as follows:

9:00 a.m. – Council Registration Opens
9:30 a.m. – Call to Order

AGENDA

1. Introduction
2. Approval of the Agenda
3. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting 25 February 2015 – *circulated with the Agenda*
4. Report from the Chair of Council
5. Report of the Council Agenda Committee
 - 5.1 Executive of Council – Appendix I – Page 2
 - 5.2 Joint Council/Senate Committee on Ceremonies - Appendix II – Page 3-4
 - 5.3 Council Committee on Academic Mission – Appendix III – Page 5-8
 - 5.4 Council Member – Appendix IV – Page 9-10
 - 5.5 Council Agenda Committee – Appendix V – Page 11-14
6. Adjournment

UNIVERSITY OF REGINA
Council

Item for Decision

Subject: *Ex officio* member of Executive of Council and Council – Director, Office of Research Services

Recommendation:

MOTION: That on Executive of Council’s recommendation, Council approve that the Director, Office of Research Services be added as an *ex officio* member of Executive of Council as defined in Section 4.3.4 of the Council Rules and Regulations.

Background and Description:

The Vice-President (Research) wishes to add the Director, Office of Research Services as an *ex officio* member of Executive of Council and Council joining the other academic directors that are defined in Appendix A of the Council Rules of Regulations. Executive of Council approved this

This position has responsibility for advancing the University of Regina’s goals and objectives related to research by providing essential support services to researchers to enable them to achieve their individual goals of excellence in research. Specifically, the Office of Research Services is critical in ensuring professional expertise to the University’s research community by sourcing out funding opportunities, providing guidance in grant proposals, ensuring compliance with regulatory bodies including ethical research standards and developing and overseeing research related policies on such matters as intellectual property, overhead, publication rights, liability, animal care, ethics, etc.

The Director, Office of Research Services is a member of the Council Committee on Research as well as the Office responsible for providing the resources to this Council Committee. By adding the Director to the Directors defined as members of Executive of Council and Council, the Director will be better able to serve in the role as Resource to the Council Committee on Research. Research is critical to the University’s mission and it is important that it be appropriately represented at Executive of Council and Council. These efforts can be furthered by ensuring that the Director can participate actively at Executive of Council and Council.

September 1, 2015

Submitted by: University Secretary on behalf of
Executive of Council

UNIVERSITY OF REGINA
Council

Item for Decision

Subject: Invocation

Recommendation:

MOTION: That Council recommend to Senate (by plurality vote) one of the following four options regarding the Invocation at Convocation:

1. To maintain the Invocation as it stands;
2. To remove the Invocation;
3. To create a standard Invocation that is inclusive; or,
4. To have a moment of silent gratitude/prayer to mark the occasion.

Background and Description:

At the Senate and Executive of Council meetings in June 2015 a recommendation was presented to remove the Invocation from the Convocation ceremony. The recommendation was made following the decision by the Supreme Court of Canada on April 15, 2015, which unanimously ruled that a Québec town could no longer open its civic meetings with a prayer. The ruling of Canada's highest court has prompted some at the University of Regina to ask whether the Invocation should continue as part of the University's Convocation ceremony.

An invocation is defined as "a form of prayer invoking God's presence, especially one said at the beginning of a religious service or public ceremony." It has been a long-standing part of the University's Convocation ceremony, and reflects the University's Regina College roots as an institution founded by a Christian denomination, the Methodists.

The recommendation regarding the Invocation was postponed at the June Senate meeting as Senate asked the Joint Committee on Ceremonies to return with a list of options regarding the Invocation for Senate's consideration. Given the decision was postponed at Senate, a formal vote was not taken at Executive of Council in June. Instead, a discussion was held on the subject of removing the Invocation from future Convocation ceremonies.

Following the meetings in June, Executive of Council members and Senators were invited to send suggestions and comments to the Joint Committee on Ceremonies through the University Secretary. After deliberating on the input and suggestions made, the Joint Committee on Ceremonies offers four options to be considered for discussion/decision by Executive of Council and Senate regarding the Invocation:

1. To maintain the Invocation as it stands;
2. To remove the Invocation;

3. To create a standard Invocation that is inclusive; or,
4. To have a moment of silent gratitude/prayer to mark the occasion.

These options were presented to Executive of Council at its September meeting. A brief discussion was held and then Executive of Council approved a motion that this matter be postponed to the next meeting of Council as it is a matter that warrants the input of Council. This matter is presented to Council to discuss and recommend to Senate its preferred option of the four options presented. With Council's input, Senate will deliberate and a final decision on the Invocation at future Convocation ceremonies will be reached at Senate's meeting scheduled for February 6, 2016.

November 27, 2015

Submitted by: Joint Committee of Senate and
Council on Ceremonies

UNIVERSITY OF REGINA
Council

Item for Decision/Information

Subject: Report from the Council Committee on Academic Mission

Background and Information:

1. Item for Decision

Preamble: Prior to 10 June 2015, CCAM participated in the approval process for new and substantially revised programs. Applications for new programs were evaluated and approved first by faculties, then by CCAM, then by CCB (Council Committee on Budget), and finally by CCUAS (Council Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Studies), or, in the case of graduate programs, by CCFGSR (Council Committee on the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research).

After procedural difficulties last summer around a specific certificate proposal, CCAM discovered that it was potentially acting outside its Council-approved jurisdiction. Our current proposed motion comes from an effort to correct that situation, and the confusion of roles upon which it rested. CCAM previously had been included under the vague but inclusive language of TOR 2, which states that one of the committee's duties is "To review and make recommendations to the President on academic planning and programming."

In contrast, CCB's and CCUAS' roles in the approval process are clearly described.

CCB TOR 4: To evaluate proposals (including budget) for new and substantially revised programs of study and recommend these to the Council Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Studies or the Council Committee on the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for their recommendation to Executive Council.

CCUAS TOR 1: To recommend proposals for new, revised, and deleted undergraduate degree and non-degree programmes to Executive of Council.

MOTION: That the Council Committee on Academic Mission's current Term of Reference 2 ("To review and make recommendations to the President on academic planning and programming") be changed to the following: "To review and make recommendations to the President on academic planning and programming; and to evaluate and recommend proposals to end, establish, and/or substantially revise programs of study to the Council Committee on Budget, the Council Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Studies, and/or the Council Committee on the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research."

Rationale: CCAM feels that its perspective on new program approval differs from the perspectives of CCB and CCUAS. CCB evaluates programs primarily (although not exclusively) in terms of budget: can we afford new programs and should we fund them? CCUAS evaluates programs primarily (although not exclusively) in terms of administration: can we administer these new programs and are they consistent in terms of requirements with other programs offered on campus? CCAM evaluates new programs (both undergraduate and, unlike CCUAS, graduate) by considering the broader academic mission of the institution: the committee asks, how will this program contribute to that mission, which includes undergraduate and graduate teaching as well as research and creative production/performance? What

opportunities will it offer our undergraduate and graduate students (as students, researchers, creative producers, teachers), our faculty (as teachers, researchers, creative producers, administrators), and our staff?

CCAM therefore recommends to University Council that CCAM participate in the approval process; that it evaluate terminated, new and substantially revised programs and make recommendations to CCB, CCUAS, and CCFGSR; and that this duty be specified clearly in the committee's Terms of Reference.

2. Item for Information

At the committee's first meeting on 2 September 2015, Dr. Leanne Groeneveld was elected as chair, replacing outgoing chair Dr. Chris Yost. At subsequent meetings on 7 October and 4 November, CCAM discussed its Terms of Reference and its need to identify and put in place processes that will allow it to fulfill its assigned duties. Discussion centred particularly on ToRS 2 (see the item for approval above) and 5 ("To review and make recommendation on the process for Faculty and Academic Unit reviews, receiving reports, and reporting to Executive of Council and Council, as required").

On the subject of ToR 5, for Council's information, a tentative schedule for Academic Unit Reviews; a new template for the self-study document; and policies and procedures outlining the responsibilities of units, CCAM, and the Provost's office has been posted to the CCAM website. The schedule and template were both approved at the 3 September 2014 University Council meeting. On 7 October 2015, CCAM struck a subcommittee to expand and make specific CCAM's role in Academic Unit Reviews; the subcommittee will recommend policies and processes CCAM should adopt to ensure that units receive useful feedback from the committee in exchange for their hard work. CCAM anticipates that unit self-studies and review committee reports will provide important evidence of the academic health of the institution. These studies and reports will therefore inform recommendations made by CCAM to University Council and to the President with the goal of maintaining and improving that health.

The Chair contacted unit heads to remind them of the recommencement of Academic Unit Reviews, to point them to resources available at the CCAM website, and to invite feedback and response to the current schedule, which originally was put forward as negotiable and flexible and remains so. (See the letter, provided below, for information). Philosophy and Classics, Physics, and the Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy are all currently completing the self-study portions of their AURs.

On 4 November, Livia Castellanos (Director, UR International) and Dr. Troni Grande (Head, Department of English) presented to CCAM the work of the English Needs Assessment Test project. The ENAT test, developed and currently being tested by a committee comprised of members from UR International, English, and English as a Second Language, evaluates and analyses the English language skills of students enrolled in ENGL 100. The ENAT committee is gathering data to assess the accuracy of this test as a predictor of success in ENGL 100 and its usefulness in identifying students requiring additional language support. CCAM is very interested in the work of this committee, conscious of Dr. Cameron Louis' concern, raised at University Council on 25 April 2013 in an item originally submitted as a motion, later submitted for information only, that "[...] the University of Regina [...] institute changes in program delivery to identify EAL problems at an early stage and provide support for at-risk EAL students" (9). The ENAT test could provide a valuable screening tool in future, identifying "at an early stage" EAL learners (international, landed immigrant, new Canadian, First Nations) as well as first-language English speakers who need additional language instruction and/or support in order to succeed in their programs of study.

Finally, CCAM has discussed revisiting and revising the Academic Mission Statement and Guiding Principles that the committee brought for approval to the 25 February 2015 Council meeting. CCAM's motion for approval was defeated. CCAM still believes that a clear definition of the academic mission and guiding principles will provide the committee and our institution with "a helpful tool for evaluating initiatives that arise from the recently approved strategic plan, 'peyak aski kikawinaw', through the lens of teaching and research" (rationale, motion, 25 February). CCAM intends, therefore, to revise the mission statement in the new year.

Letter to Heads re AURs, sent November 2015

I'm writing on behalf of the Council Committee on Academic Mission (CCAM) to inform you that, after a long suspension, the cycle of academic unit reviews has resumed. These reviews are now under the purview of CCAM, a committee created in 2013 by University Council, its members elected to represent that body.

At the Council meeting of 10 September 2014, CCAM presented to the membership a tentative schedule for academic unit reviews (agenda item 5.2). This schedule prioritizes those units reviewed least recently. It was approved by Council, and so, in 2015/16, we've begun our first cycle. I've attached the schedule to this email for your information.

I'd like to stress that, rather than being final, this schedule is flexible, an aid to planning and preparation. (In the minutes for the 10 September 2014 meeting, it is recorded that CCAM then informed Council members "The time table is a guideline and can be adjustable"). Units may request earlier or later dates – for example, to coincide unit with accreditation reviews to avoid unnecessary duplication. Units that feel they are struggling may wish to be reviewed sooner to draw CCAM's attention to their particular challenges.

If you agree to the timing of review for your unit, you will be contacted at the start of your assigned academic year. You can find information about the review process, review policies, and a template for the self-study document at the following link:

<http://www.uregina.ca/president/executive-team/provost-vp-academic/academic-unit-reviews/index.html>

The revised review template is much shorter than past templates and, like the overall schedule for academic unit reviews, is intended to serve as a guide rather than a straitjacket. An individual unit may modify this template if/as necessary to produce a document clear and meaningful to a review committee of experts in your discipline.

CCAM appreciates the time and effort required to complete the self-study and to coordinate the site visit, and we thank you for your help and cooperation. Please remember that unit reviews have been reinstated by a committee of your peers, a committee tasked to maintain and enhance the academic health of this institution. These reviews will provide CCAM with information necessary to undertake this important task and will allow the committee to make recommendations to University Council, and through Council to the President, on how best to sustain and advance our academic mission.

If you have any questions or would like to change your scheduled academic year of review, please don't hesitate to contact me. CCAM will do its best to accommodate your unit's needs. Please note, however, that our ability to accommodate requests for change to the schedule will be limited by and dependent on the capacity of our administrative support. Preparation of review documents, scheduling of site visits and external reviewers all require a great deal of planning.

Best,

Dr. Leanne Groeneveld
Chair, CCAM
Associate Professor, Theatre Studies
Campion College

November 27, 2015
Submitted by: Council Committee on
Academic Mission

UNIVERSITY OF REGINA
Council

Item for Decision

Subject: Mid-term review process

Recommendation:

MOTION: That Council recommends to the President the establishment of a mid-term review process for senior academic administrators including Associate Deans, Deans, Directors, AVPs and VPs, so that inputs from Council members will be solicited in a transparent and collegial way.

Background and Description:

Rationale:

A University conducts continuous reviews of its members. Students are evaluated several times in each class they take every semester, when they take mid-term exams, submit assignments and project reports, give presentations, and take final examinations. Professors and instructors are evaluated for their teaching performances by the students during the mid-term and final course reviews. Their performances are also reviewed at the annual reviews by their peers, their Deans, and sometimes by the Campus Promotions Committee.

The issue of conducting mid-term reviews for senior academic administrators including Associate Deans, Deans, Directors, AVPs and VPs has been raised and discussed before. For example, it was raised at the discussion that President V. Timmons had with Faculty members in February 2015 (see *Attachment A*). It is now an appropriate time to formally request that this mid-term review process of our senior academic administrators be established, so that comments and inputs on their performances can be solicited from the University Council in a transparent and collegial way.

Academic freedom is a core value of our University community. To ensure we work in a collegial environment where academic freedom of every individual Council member is respected, it is imperative that we are ALL subject to a review process in which feedback on our performances are obtained and considered. This applies not only to students, academic staff (including professors, instructors, and lecturers), but also to all senior academic administrators. A mid-term review of all senior administrators will provide feedback on how policies and administrative practices, which may have been formulated with the best intentions, are in fact affecting the constituency including the academic staff. If our University is indeed committed to fostering a collegial and democratic work culture, then instituting a mid-term review process of senior academic administrators is a crucial step towards ensuring that our senior administrators truly engage in a dialogue with and listen to the concerns of the Council members.

November 27, 2015
Submitted by: Dr. Farshid Torabi

ATTACHMENT A

From: Rozanne Tennent
To:
Date: 2015-02-13 1:30 PM
Subject: Summary of meeting with President

Sent on behalf of President Timmons (her response to issue is in italics):

Colleagues,

Thank you for meeting with me yesterday and for your forthright comments. Here is a summary of the issues raised:

- Need to instill a research culture into the campus and support graduate teaching. *(Need to work with all on this)*
- Need to continue investing in support for graduate students. *(This is a priority in the budget, a challenge with the fiscal reality)*
- Concern that graduate teaching is not counted as part of the teaching load. *(A survey will be done to get data on the different approaches to graduate teaching)*
- There are opportunities for shared teaching with the University of Saskatchewan which we could explore. *(Encourage more collaboration)*
- There is a concern about the non replacement of tenured faculty, especially in areas that provide service courses such as English. *(Keep in mind as resources are allocated)*
- There is a request to reassess the partnership we have with the Federated Colleges and how teaching is allotted. *(Discussion to be held with Provost)*
- There needs to be an alignment on review of senior administrators; there seems to be different approaches to reviewing Deans and VPs. *(Will review with HR)*
- There is an interest in exploring mid-term review for Deans. *(Will review with HR)*
- There is a concern about the polarization between Administration and Academic. *(Need to work on campus communication and morale)*
- Survey information should be available for campus. *(Will follow up)*
- There is a lot of concern about the new timetabling system. *(Monitor the concerns and responsiveness).*
- There is a request for the numbers related to revenue and expenditures in Donor Relations. *(Will get the data and share)*
- Equipment, classrooms and labs in some departments need to be revitalized. Monies may be available from companies. *(President will chat with Donor Relations about this)*
- Need to celebrate excellence. *(Will continue to look for opportunities)*
- Consideration should be given to the number of international students in faculties. Can funding follow these students to the Departments? *(Ongoing discussion)*
- Can we look at long term budget and priority planning? *(Discuss with VPs and Board)*
- Have presentations by researchers at the Leg with U of S. *(D. Malloy to follow up)*
- More admin AVPs compared to academic AVPs. *(As each AVP position becomes vacant it will be assessed and potentially reclassified).*

Vianne

UNIVERSITY OF REGINA
Council

Item for Information

Subject: Council Agenda Committee

Background and Information:

Report from the Chair of the Council Agenda Committee for the Dec 9/15 Meeting of University Council:

- 1) The Council Agenda Committee considered the motion proposed by Council member Ann Ward (see *Attachment A*) and determined that this is a matter that in the first instance falls within the purview of the Council Committee on Academic Mission (CCAM), which is the council committee from which the policy on academic unit reviews originates. As such, the Agenda Committee refers this matter back to CCAM for its timely consideration. The Agenda Committee does, however, remain seized of this issue and is open to revisiting this motion for a future meeting of council.
- 2) The Council Agenda Committee received a submission from several individuals who are not members of Council pertaining to item 5.2 (see *Attachment B*). The Council Rules and Regulations do not at present specify whether, or how, the submissions from non-members are to be included in the agenda for Council meetings. As such, in a spirit of transparency we have included the submission as an attachment to this report, but also remind Council that this submission was not presented by members of Council and does not speak on behalf of any individuals or colleges represented in Council.
- 3) **Time set aside for General Discussion:** An institutional norm has developed at the University of Regina by which time is set aside on the agenda of Executive of Council and of various faculty councils for matters of general discussion. This salutary practice allows for relatively informal, but often fruitful, discussion among a community of dialogic partners within a shared institutional setting. The Council Agenda Committee proposes to make such a designated period for general discussion part of the agenda for future meetings of Council. In keeping with the legislatively established role and responsibilities of Council, the matters for discussion should pertain to broad policy questions and issues of long term interest of the university. As part of the call for agenda items for the April meeting of University Council, we will ask members of Council if they wish to propose matters for discussion in this period.
- 4) The Agenda Committee continues to invite and welcome all members of Council to consider proposing decision items (motions), as well as information items for future meetings of University Council. The Agenda Committee serves all of Council. If any member of Council has any questions or thoughts about potential agenda items for council meetings, do not hesitate to consult with me or any of your colleagues on the Agenda Committee.

November 30, 2015
Submitted by: Lee Ward,
Chair of the Council Agenda Committee

UNIVERSITY OF REGINA
Council

**Item for Information
Referred to CCAM**

Subject: Policy amendment – Academic Unit Review

Recommendation:

MOTION: With regard to the Academic Unit Review policy document, Number: OPS-130-005, under the heading **Site Visit** on p.5, that the third sentence in the second paragraph which currently reads, “The on-site consultations commence with a working dinner hosted by the University administration and end with an exit interview with the Provost and Vice-President (Academic), the Vice-President (Research), the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research and the Dean of the faculty,” be changed to, “The on-site consultations commence with a working dinner hosted by the University administration **which includes but is not limited to at least one faculty member from the academic unit being reviewed, in departmentalized faculty normally the Head or the Head’s faculty designate**, and end with an exit interview with the Provost and Vice-President (Academic), the Vice-President (Research), the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research and the Dean of the faculty.”

Background and Description:

Rationale:

The working dinner which commences the unit review will set the tone for the consultations that will follow and will be the first impression of the academic unit received by the external reviewers who are to carry out the review of that unit. It is therefore important that the external reviewers at this working dinner have the opportunity to get an initial sense of the academic unit from the faculty perspective in addition to the perspective of the university Administration. The revision above suggests that faculty representation at the working dinner not be limited to one faculty representative so that departments that work closely with faculty colleagues at the federated colleges and First Nations University can invite a faculty representative, normally the Head or Area Representative, from the College or First Nations University department.

November 27, 2015
Submitted by: Dr. Ann Ward

To Whom it May Concern at Executive Council,

We are writing on the behalf of several university community members and campus groups to share our views about the recent discussion concerning the status of the Invocation at the University of Regina Convocation ceremony. Unfortunately, we are not privy to the specific arguments being offered by those who wish to end the practice of Invocation, but we hope that our responses are not too wide of the mark.

In our understanding, some members of our university community consider the practice of Invocation as exclusive, perhaps even offensive, and inappropriate for a secular institution that should preserve neutrality in religious matters.

Let us state, first of all, that we respect the nature of the University as a secular institution. We have no desire to use the ceremonies of the University to further the cause of any one religion over against believers of other religions or those of no religion.

On the other hand, it is our understanding and experience that Invocation has not, in fact, been used to this end in the recent past. Indeed, the recent Invocation offered by Rev. John Meehan S.J. was inclusive not only of members of any religion, but of non-believers as well.

Invocation is a time to recognize all that has led us to where we are and to be grateful for the gifts and opportunities we have received. For the majority, who believe in some higher power, this may include thanking God, but this does not mean the practice is of no value to non-believers, nor that they are somehow being excluded.

It is, of course, possible to imagine a given Invocation failing to be inclusive of the broader community represented at the university, but that would be the fault of either the person giving the Invocation or of those who invited that person to give it. But the inclusivity proper to convocation at a secular institution like the University of Regina is not threatened by Invocation.

In a similar vein, we would also like to challenge the suggestion that the act of thanking God (or whatever or whomever one chooses to thank) could be rightly understood as an offensive act. Whatever some of us may think of the religious or ideological convictions of other members of our communities, it is surely contrary to the spirit of a secular institution to insist that a given act is offensive simply for being "religious" or invoking God.

If the University of Regina were to stop offering an Invocation at Convocation because that act is considered "offensive" by some, the institution could hardly be considered a neutral space, for it would be saying that a conviction as natural, reasonable, and human as gratitude is somehow rendered offensive by its mere association with "religion."

What does such a decision say to "religious" students, faculty and staff about their place in the institution? These members of our community would have the right to wonder just what criteria are being used to determine what constitutes an offence.

A secular institution is and should be a place open to those of any or no religious affiliation. Unfortunately, some promote a version of secularism that is openly antagonistic to religion. This version imagines that neutrality is achieved only by eliminating any reference to God or religion. But that is a false neutrality, one that in fact privileges the non-religious perspective.

A healthy secularism is inclusive of religious people and perspectives. It neither grants them any special rights or privileges, nor does it rule them out-of-bounds.

We submit, then, that the appropriate decision for a secular institution with a variety of religious and non-religious perspectives represented is not to reject the practice of Invocation as exclusive or offensive, but to encourage an Invocation that is inclusive of all. Surely there are qualified individuals from a variety of religious backgrounds who could be trusted with such a task.

Sincerely,

S. Molloy
Campion College Campus Minister

Sam Bell - Luther College Chaplain

D. Gallo - Catholic Christian Outreach

W. H. Miller - Campion Knights of Columbus 15955